



UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:

Tribal Operations
1277-65

MAR 24 1965

MAR 25 1965

Hon. James M. Hanley
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hanley:

This is in reply to your letter of March 8 on behalf of Mr. Jacob Thompson of Nedrow, New York. Mr. Thompson believes that the State of New York has not met certain treaty obligations to the Oneidas of New York, and is requesting assistance in bringing suit against the State.

Specifically, he alleges that the State of New York has not made any payment to the Oneida Indians since 1840 of funds he believes the State agreed to pay under treaties between the Oneida Tribe and the State. It is true that between 1788 and 1842, a series of treaties or agreements were made between the Oneida Tribe and the State of New York by which title to the tribal land was ceded to New York. (House Doc. No. 1590, 63d Congress; 3d Session; U. S. v. Boylan, 265 F. 165.) Those treaties are not available to this Bureau, however, and we are not aware of unpaid contractual obligations undertaken by the State in these treaties. Evidently, Mr. Thompson and others have been informed previously by State authorities that any claim which the Oneidas believe they have against the State can be settled only by appropriate litigation. Neither this Bureau nor the Department of the Interior employs attorneys to provide legal services to individual Indians or Indian tribes in the prosecution of claims which they believe they have against others; nor do we have any funds which we could give or lend the tribe for this purpose. However, some tribes are currently employing attorneys on a contingency basis, and the New York Oneidas may be interested in looking into the possibility of entering into a contract of this type if they are unable to obtain satisfaction from any other source.

*Belmont
read all 175
of 5 v.s.p.a.*



Onedus bringing several hundred bags of corn to Washington's starving army at Valley Forge, after the colonists had consistently refused to aid them.

Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Inc.



DEWA SAGHWA 1811
Because of the... of the Oneida... in... a... ship... the... of Pennsylvania... nation, the U.S. States was... able.

DE PERE
ROUTE 4



WISCONSIN
54115

Press Release

Recently the Oneida Indian Nation won a suit in federal court for a claim to lands possessed by Oneida and Madison counties. Because of the importance of their action to every citizen we wish to take this opportunity to explain the nature of the Oneida Land Claims.

During the Revolutionary War the Indian Nations on the frontier of New York were called upon by Britain join in suffering the colonies. Had the Six Nations joined in concerted action the results would have been disastrous. But the Oneidas refused to join Britain and steadfastly fought on the side of the colonies throughout the war. For this service the Oneidas were guaranteed their lands forever by a grateful nation.

Even before the national government signed the treaty (Fort Stanux 1784) assuring the Oneidas their land the state of New York had set about to undermine that protection. In 1785 the State forced the Oneidas against their will, to surrender a large area of land in Broome and Chenango counties. Governor Clinton told the Oneidas that if they did not sell the land to New York he would not protect them from whites who would trespass their land. He also guaranteed that this would be his last request for a sale of land. Three years later Clinton returned to the Oneidas. This time the Oneidas had leased their lands to John Livingston and the governor and legislature secretly voided that lease and then told the Oneidas that the only way they could recover their lands by leasing them to New York. Again the Oneidas were lied to and swindled and for a mere \$600 a year rent the Oneidas leased over 6 million acres, reserving a small amount for their sole use. Following that, the state proceeded to strip the rest of the land by causing dissatisfaction and splitting the tribe. The end result was that by the middle of the 19th century most Oneidas lands were lost and the Oneidas gone.

It is often argued that the claims of the Indians have long laid dormant and therefore are questionable. This is grouply not true. As Judge Port pointed out in his decision the Oneidas made timely and repeated efforts to remedy thier plight but were repeatedly thworted by federal and state officals. Most recently the Oneidas sought redress from two governors, the New York State Legislature, the Congress, and the President to no avail. Reluctantly, the Oneidas entered a suit always open to negotiation.

The plain truth is that the opportunities to reduce the wrongs done to the Nation's oldest ally were always available, but the State has consistently refused to seek a compromise.

Recently the Oneida Indian Nation won a suit in federal court for a claim to lands possessed by Oneida and Madison counties. Because of the importance of their action to every citizen we wish to take this opportunity to explain the nature of the Oneida Land Claims.

During the Revolutionary War the Indian Nations on the frontier of New York were called upon by Britain join in suffering the colonies. Had the Six Nations joined in concerted action the results would have been disastrous. But the Oneidas refused to join Britain and steadfastly fought on the side of the colonies throughout the war. For this service the Oneidas were guaranteed their lands forever by a grateful nation.

Even before the national government signed the treaty (Fort Stanux 1784) assuring the Oneidas their land the state of New York had set about to undermine that protection. In 1785 the state forced the Oneidas against their will, to surrender a large area of land in Brome and Chenango counties. Governor Clinton told the Oneidas that if they did not sell the land to New York he would not protect them from whites who would trespass their land. He also guaranteed that this would be his last request for a sale of land. Three years later Clinton returned to the Oneidas. This time the Oneidas had leased their lands to John Livingston and the governor and legislature secretly voided that

that lease and then told the Oneidas that the only way they could recover their lands by leasing them to New York. Again the Oneidas were lied to and swindled and for a mere \$600 a year rent the Oneidas leased over 6 million acres, reserving a small amount for their sole use. Following that, the state proceeded to strip the rest of the land by causing dissatisfaction and splitting the tribe. The end result was that by the middle of the 19th century most Oneidas lands were lost and the Oneidas gone.

It is often argued that the claims of the Indians have long laid dormant and therefore are questionable. This is grossly not true. As Judge Port pointed out in his decision the Oneidas made timely and repeated efforts to remedy their plight but were repeatedly thwarted by federal and state officials. Most recently the Oneidas sought redress from two governors, the New York State Legislature, the Congress, and the President to no avail. Reluctantly, the Oneidas entered a suit always open to negotiation.

The plain truth is that the opportunities to reduce the wrongs done to the Nation's oldest ally were always available, but the State has consistently refused to seek a compromise.